FILE:

B-218177

DATE:

April 18, 1985

MATTER OF:

Alaska Media Productions

DIGEST:

A private courier's handwritten notation of the time of delivery of a bid generally cannot be used to determine whether or not a bid is late because the only acceptable evidence to establish the time of receipt of a bid at a government installation is the time/date stamp of the installation or other documentary evidence of receipt maintained by the installation.

Alaska Media Productions (AMP) protests the rejection of its bid as late by the Government Printing Office, Seattle Regional Printing Procurement Office (SRPPO), under the Invitation for Bids for Program 1079-S. We deny the protest.

Bid opening for the competition was set for January 23, 1985, at 2:00 p.m. at the SRPPO. The record shows that AMP's bid had been given to an air courier service in Anchorage, Alaska late in the afternoon of January 22, 1985, for overnight delivery to the SRPPO.

The protester asserts that the bid was received by the SRPPO at precisely 2:00 p.m. on January 23, as indicated by the log sheet of the air courier showing that the bid had been signed for by a receptionist at the agency at "1400" (the time written in next to the signature in a column marked time). The agency states, however, that the bid arrived at 2:05 p.m. and was immediately clocked in with a time/date stamp which, through a recurring mechanical fault, registered a receipt time of 2:15 p.m. In this respect, the agency report notes that the 10-minute marker wheel on its time/date stamp occasionally jumps forward one digit, hence the 2:15 time indication.

AMP asks that we rely on the notation "1400" written on the air courier's log sheet. However, the only acceptable evidence to establish the time of receipt of a

bid at a government installation is the time/date stamp of the installation or other documentary evidence of receipt maintained by the installation. Federal Acquisition Regulations, 48 C.F.R. § 14.304-1(c) (1984); Edmonds Electric Company; Warren's Air Conditioning and Heating Service, Inc., B-213145; B-213145.2, Apr. 24, 1984, 84-1 CPD ¶ 468. Consequently, we have held that the records of a commercial carrier showing delivery to the agency's installation prior to bid opening are insufficient to establish that the bid was, in fact, received by the agency prior to bid opening. Qualimetrics, Inc., B-213162, Mar. 20, 1984, 84-1 CPD ¶ 332. In addition, we note the sworn statement in the record of the SRPPO receptionist that she does not recall seeing any time written on the air courier's log sheet when she signed for AMP's bid. We therefore find no merit to the protest.

The protest is denied.

Harry R. Van Cleve General Counsel